THE DIMENSION OF CIVILIZATION

CHIEF EDITOR / **LU PENG**

中国青年出版社

Inspiration, Appropriation, Creation: Sources of Chinoiserie Imagery, Colour Schemes and Designs in the Royal Pavilion, Brighton (1802 – 1823)

Alexandra Loske

This paper identifies key figures and artistic methods involved in the creation of the Chinoiserie interiors of the Royal Pavilionin Brighton and discusses to what extent personal taste and fashion informed George IV's collecting habits and design decisions, as well as those of his designers. None of the members of the Royal Family, nor George IV's architects and designers had travelled to the Far East and thus created these oriental interiors by using Chinese export art as reference points and inspiration, thus appropriating a foreign and "exotic" culture, resulting in the creation of highly inventive and playful interiors. The aim is to establish how far these key figures reflect wider trends and developments in design and colour choices in interior design and the decorative arts in early nineteenth century British interiors.

The paper begins by focussing on the influence of other members of the Royal Family on the look of the Royal Pavilion, with particular focus on Chinoiserie interiors or collections created by George IV's mother, sisters and other relatives, either before or alongside the creation of the Royal Pavilion. Based on close analysis of primary archival sources, the paper will also discuss to what extent George IV was actively involved in design decisions and their implementation. In this context the significance of royal palaceswith Chinoiserie interiors preceding the Royal Pavilion or developing alongside it, notably the interiors of Carlton House and Frogmore House, will also be considered. Finally, the paper brings together information on the work of George IV's designers Robert Jones and the Crace family of decorators, relating to colour, colour theory, export ware, and their specific design styles and painting techniques. While much is known about the Crace

family, Robert Jones's life and work has until now not been comprehensively researched and is here presented for the first time.

George IV and his family

This section will discuss King George IV's (1762-1830, reigned 1820-1830) role as a patron of the arts and architecture in general and his degree of involvement with design decisions at the Royal Pavilion, his Oriental holiday palace in Brighton on the south coast of England, in particular. In this context I will underline the significance of his parents' artistic tastes and collecting habits and the particularly strong female influence George IV was exposed to in his family. Since Chinoiserie in interior design was a style often associated with women, it is worth considering how both his mother's and his sisters' interest in it shaped George IV's taste for the exotic in the early nineteenth century. This section will also consider English oriental buildings and interiors that are likely to have informed the creation of the Royal Pavilion, some designed by family members or ancestors, some by George IV himself. Of particular significance here are Frogmore House in Windsor Great Park and Carlton House in London.

George IV is often considered one of the great collectors and patrons of the arts in British royal history, with only Charles I (1600–1649) as a possible comparison. He was a keen collector of art, in particular Dutch, Flemish and French paintings, but didn't show much interest in Italian masters. In view of how and where George IV placed paintings in the interiors at Windsor Castle, Carlton House and other palaces, it is clear that his fine art collecting habits would often be informed by the vision of a complete interior design scheme. Thus paintings would be hung in dedicated wall spaces, often on dark red or green backgrounds, framed by gilt mouldings, or, in the case of the Chinese export paintings in the Royal Pavilion, stuck directly onto the walls and incorporated into the wallpaper design, complete with trompe l'oeil frames. However, it has to be noted that the Royal Pavilion did never include a dedicated art gallery. Its interiors represent complete interior design schemes, where each artefact and painting has as predominantly decorative value and a specific place in the overall scheme.

Early biographers such as Robert Huish[1] tend not to discuss George IV's collecting habits and architectural passions other than in the context of expenditure and excess, a critical attitude which is reflected in some contemporary satirical prints. Robert Seymour's *The Great Joss and his Playthings* from February 1829 is perhaps a caricature that most directly comments on George IV's excessive building projects, of which the Royal Pavilion is visually the most effective example. Here George IV is depicted as a fat Chinese Mandarin sitting on a teapot spouting public money, which pays for his expensive hobbies, including a real giraffe, and various building projects, including the remodelling of Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, the Hyde Park Corner arches and others. The Royal Pavilion is placed closest to his head and is immediately recognisable by its Indian domes and minarets. The print is embellished with further references to the exotic exterior and interior style of the Royal Pavilion.[2] A similar print by S.W. Fores from 1820, *New Baubles for the Chinese Temple*, once again associates George IV's restless decorating and building activities and his taste for Chinoiserie with childishness and immaturity. Various Chinese objects, including a large pagoda, dragons and Chinese figures frame the scene in which George IV throws a tantrum, having been declined an increase in his salary.[3] Style criticism directly aimed at the Royal Pavilion was common in printed texts, and in the medium of caricature the building is a visual representation ofGeorge IV's obsession with building and decoration projects of questionable taste and scale.

Twentieth- and twenty-first century critical literature on George IV does elaborate on his role as patron, connoisseur, collector and builder. In his 2001 biography of George IV, *The Grand Entertainment*, Steven Parissien devotes two consecutive chapters on this aspect of George IV's character, distinguishing between 'Architectural Patronage' and his role as a 'Connoisseur of Fine Art'[4], in which he rightly states that his 'love for art was another characteristic undoubtedly inherited from his father and, more particularly, from his grandfather [Frederick, Prince of Wales]'.[5] Stressing the influence of his father may seem surprising, given their lifelong differences, but while George III's tastes in art might have been different from his son's, his general attitude to connoisseurship clearly shaped young George IV's interests.

Crucially, it was William Chambers' exotic buildings at Kew Gardens, designed under the patronage of Frederick, Prince of Wales and the Earl of Bute and finished in 1762, the year of George IV's birth, which might have sparked an interest in oriental architecture. Apart from the Pagoda, the largest of the exotic structures at Kew, young Prince George would have seen an 'Alhambra' (built in 1758) and a 'Mosque' (built in 1761). This area of oriental buildings and follies at Kew is referred to in a watercolour from 1763 by William Marlow as 'the wilderness' and can almost certainly be considered George IV's first exposure to oriental architecture and design. Of these buildings only the Pagoda survives, probably because it was the most substantial of the 'wilderness' structures, but it is worth noting that the Pagoda young Prince George would have seen in the 1760s was a much more colourful and ornamented building than what remains

today. Its ten roofs were once varnished in different colours and from each of the eight corners of each roof were suspended dragons which Chambers describes as 'covered with a kind of thin coloured glass of various colours, which produced a most dazzling reflection'.[6] It is possible that these glazed dragons were a direct inspiration for the transparent coloured glazes found on many silvered objects, including carved dragons, in the Royal Pavilion's Music Room and Banqueting Room. Other buildings, now lost, from the 'wilderness' may also have informed George IV's later design decisions, as for example the 'House of Confucius', a two-storey octagon building in a Chinese style, probably designed by Joseph Goupy. Its interiors are described by Chambers thus: 'Its walls and ceiling are painted with grotesque ornaments, and little historical subjects relating to Confucius, with several transactions of the Christian missions in China.'[7]

Another of these lost ornamental buildings might have inspired a specific motif applied in the Oriental interiors of the Royal Pavilion: the interior of the 'Mosque', another octagonal building, flanked by two cabinets and topped by a dome, built by Chambers himself in 1761, boasted stucco palm trees which, in execution and colouring, are reminiscent of the intricately painted and coloured palm trees by Robert Jones for the Red Drawing Room. Chambers' description and the actual objects might well have been known to the principal interior decorators of the Royal Pavilion, John and Frederick Crace and Robert Jones: 'At the eight angles of the room are palm-trees modelled in stucco, painted and varnished with various hues of green, in imitation of nature; which at the top spread and support the dome, represented as forms of reeds, bound together with ribbons of silk.'[8] The whole is set against walls painted in 'rich rose colour' and 'straw colour'. By comparison, an entry in Jones's account books describing the palm trees in the Red Drawing Room of the Royal Pavilion reads 'Painting in imitation of Bamboo 14 trees with their gradations of Color from the ground upwards to their foliage, which is finished with bright Greens and highly Varnished.'[9]

In the field of the decorative arts George IV has no rival as a collector, with many of his purchases reflecting his excitable nature and fondness for excess. Within the decorative arts furniture, weapons, and silver-gilt dominated and throughout his life he had a particular penchant for French art. He chose the Francophile architect Henry Holland as an architect for the first manifestation of the Royal Pavilion, modelled very closely on the Hotel de Salm in Paris. Even after the complete internal and external oriental transformation of the Royal Pavilion, French influences remained noticeable in certain decorative details as well as in French cuisine as the choice of food and the employment of a French chef, Antonin Carême, in 1817 for the newly built Great Kitchen and Banqueting Room. At his London residence, Carlton House, the French presence was indeed all-pervasive. George was an avid collector of Sèvresporcelain and Boulle furniture. George IV '*smarchand-mercier* Dominique Daguerre supplied and also designed much of the furniture, with Holland providing many of the French-inspired exteriors and interiors. This preoccupation with French art is perhaps best explained by a desire to emulate the splendours of the court of Louis XIV. It is tempting to interpret the move away from French Neo-Classicism and, in Brighton, the embracing of Chinoiserie as a reaction to anti-French sentiments during the Napoleonic wars, but the reasons for choosing this particular look for the Royal Pavilion are more complex. Megan Aldrich argues that the early Chinoiserie interiors of the Royal Pavilion, mostly designed by John Crace, developed from Neo-Classical design aesthetics, specifically with regard to the structural division of decorative surfaces and the use of bold base colours.[10]

The creation of the Royal Pavilion interiors was perhaps fuelled less by a particular collecting habit or interest, than by the desire to create a small yet opulent pleasure palace away from the London court, exceptional and extreme in style, as well as having a very specific purpose: entertainment. The interiors were thus influenced by both the palace's location in the thriving seaside resort of Brighton (at a considerable distance from London, yet accessible in a few hours) and the main function of the building. The social life and location of Brighton probably encouraged more daring, playful and experimental designs, which reflected the mood of Brighton in general and enhanced the reputation the seaside resort had already acquired.

The female influence

While the exotic buildings dotted around Kew Gardens may have been a formative influence on George IV's taste for Oriental architecture in general, it can be argued that with regard to interior design schemes he was greatly influenced by female members of his family, specifically his mother, Queen Charlotte, and his sisters Charlotte (the Princess Royal), Elizabeth and Augusta. A well-known painting by Johann Zoffany shows Queen Charlotte in her sitting room in Buckingham House (later Buckingham Palace) in c.1765[11], in the company of her eldest sons George and William, aged three and two. While on this occasion Charlotte is dressed in typical Rococo dress, her sons are wearing fancy dress costume, George the uniform of a Graeco-Roman soldier and William Middle Eastern garb with turban. Charlotte, too, was known to have been portrayed in Oriental costume and to have attended masquerade balls. The furnishings and decorative objects in the room reflect Charlotte's interest in collecting Oriental goods and export

ware, such as blue and white china: the composition is brought together by a richly coloured Persian rug and, on the mantelpiece, two Chinese nodding figures can be seen, which appear almost identical to those later displayed in the Long Gallery of the Royal Pavilion.

Collecting exotic export ware and furnishing rooms in a Chinoiserie style were associated with the female sphere, so Queen Charlotte's tastes were not unusual, but they appear to have made a significant impact on those of her eldest son. George IV would also have been familiar with the substantial collection of blue and white china (export ware as well as European imitations) introduced to the English court by Queen Mary II (r. 1689-1694) at Hampton Court and Kensington Palace and clearly continued by Queen Charlotte and her daughters.[12]

Queen Charlotte had several rooms at Windsor Castle and Buckingham House (later re-named Buckingham Palace) designed in a Chinoiserie style or embellished with Chinoiserie elements. Although these interiors do not survive, they are well recorded in W.H. Pyne's *The History of the Royal Residences*. In the case of the Queen's State Bedchamber at Windsor Castle, where red forms the main background colour, Pyne notes 'the new walls being judiciously coloured with a tint that does not obtrude itself on the eye; a circumstance that should be attended to in all picture galleries.'[13] The room is significant in having at least four black lacquer cabinets, introducing a Chinoiserie element to what was effectively a picture gallery. The room is shown in Pyne as it appeared in James Wyatt's design from 1804[14], making it only slightly later than the first Chinoiserie interiors at the Royal Pavilion, but the cabinets are likely to have been acquired much earlier. However, other Chinoiserie interiors predate both the Royal Pavilion and even the early Chinese drawing room at Carlton House. Queen Charlotte's Breakfast Room at Buckingham House was furnished with black and gold painted panelling that had been transferred from the Crimson Drawing Room in 1763.[15]Pyne describes the panels as 'formed of beautiful japan, which has a pleasing effect.'[16] The room was further embellished with some of Queen Charlotte's collection of oriental and European china on shelves and on the chimneypiece. The watercolour that informed the aquatint in Pyne shows the arrangement of the room in c. 1810, but the collection of china is recorded as in situ from at least 1783.[17] This room is a telling example of George IV's mother's interest in Chinoiserie, and might have inspired the later lacquer panelled rooms at Frogmore House. Buckingham House, Frogmore House and Carlton House are thus relevant comparative studies and to some extent predecessors of the extreme oriental approach at Brighton's Royal Pavilion.

At Frogmore House, the female creativity of female members of the Royal Family resulted in several complete Chinoiserie schemes in the early nineteenth century. Frogmore House, in Pyne named 'Queen's House', had long been associated with female royal occupants, such as Queen Anne and Queen Caroline. In 1792 Queen Charlotte renewed the lease on the house and instructed Mr Wyatt to convert the existing house into a neo-classical villa set in a picturesque environment. Following these improvements the house and its setting were frequently used for fetes, concerts and garden parties from 1795 onwards.[18] The house also became strongly associated with two of Queen Charlotte's daughters, the Princesses Elizabeth and the Princess Royal (also Charlotte). [19]

While the Princess Royal and Princess Augusta had inherited their mother's interest in drawing, engraving and botanical illustration, Princess Elizabeth was particularly interested in the interior decoration of several royal residences. With some input from the Princess Royal, she is considered to be the designer of three Chinoiserie interiors of Frogmore House, two of which she appears to have partly executed herself. In Pyne's*Royal Residences* two of the six aquatints, based on Charles Wild watercolours, illustrating the house depict these Chinoiserie interiors: the Red Japan Room[20] and the Green Closet[21]. A further Black Japan Room and a barely described India Room are not illustrated. As complete interior design schemes, these rooms are of utmost significance to the development of the decorative schemes of the Pavilion in Brighton. Like the Royal Pavilion's Chinoiserie schemes, they are a post-Rococo manifestation of the Chinoiserie fashion and represent the late, more vibrant flowering of what was considered a feminine style. It is unclear whether the Chinese interiors at Carlton House or the first Chinese interior at the Royal Pavilion preceded these rooms at Frogmore, but a mutual influence and inspiration among the Royal siblings can be assumed and might explain the sudden cluster of early nineteenth century Chinoiserie interiors in the circle of George IV.

Both the Princess Royal and Princess Elizabeth are credited by Pyne with producing much of the ornamental painting of the walls of Frogmore and at the Queen's Lodge (the latter probably referring to the Queen's *cottage orné* at Kew). Elizabeth is credited with painting the panels and some of the furniture in the Red Japan Room: 'The walls of this apartment were painted, in imitation of rich japan, by her Royal Highness the Princess Elizabeth; the furniture was ornamented by the same tasteful hand.' [22]The room appears to have been further embellished with a combination of Chinese teapots and European imitations of Chinese porcelain. Elizabeth also appears to have created the walls of the Black Japan Room, a room in which, according to Pyne, 'an additional interest is excited, in knowing that the taste which the room displays, is all

the work of female ingenuity', since the embroidery of the upholstery and soft furnishings was carried out by a school for orphans established under the patronage of Queen Charlotte.[23]

The Red Japan Room was the central room facing the garden on the ground floor of Frogmore House and is now called the Yellow Drawing Room. What the Royal Pavilion interiors and the japanned rooms at Frogmore House have in common is a radical and assured transformation from a classically inspired style, including garlands, medallions, urns and trellis-work, to a Chinoiserie style created sometime between 1797 and 1807. Jane Roberts refers to the drawing by Henry Wigstead, inscribed 'Frogmore Hall at the Fete 1797', that shows the Red Japan Room almost certainly decorated for a fête in the Neo-classical style. Roberts then quotes a letter from Princess Elizabeth, who had introduced the garlands in 1793, from 19 September 1807, in which she tells her friend Lady Cathcart: 'I am busy putting up my Japan room at Frogmore, which place [sic] is as dear to me as ever'.[24]

The India Room is described only in a few lines as an interior featuring an elaborately carved ivory bed, white satin embroidered upholstery and red velvet cushions, without a reference to a designer or creator.[25] A set of Indian sandalwood settees and chairs, veneered in ivory, was also an important feature in the later manifestation of the Royal Pavilion's Long Gallery. These benches and chairs, quite possibly inspired by the India Room at Frogmore House, lifted the design scheme of the Long Gallery considerably, adding a rare splash of very light coloured finishes to a scheme that otherwise avoids shades of cream, buff or white. They originally belonged to Queen Charlotte, but were bought by George IV in 1819 shortly after her death, indicating that he shared his mother's taste in oriental objects.[26] The settees are no longer in situ in the Royal Pavilion, but survive in the Royal Collection (RCIN 489).

The Green Closet formed the third Chinoiserie interior at Frogmore and is described as an 'apartment fitted up with original japan, of a beautiful fabric, on a pure green ground. The cabinets and chairs are of Indian cane.' [27]Some of the numerous oriental objects seen in Wild's watercolour may have been presents given by the Emperor Qianlong to George III in 1793, suggesting that most of the interior consisted of authentic oriental materials and objects.[28] Crucially, both the Red Japan Room and the Green Closet are clearly represented as female spaces in the illustrations: both watercolours show the rooms occupied by seated women; in the case of the Green Closet a single seated female figure reading, and in the case of the Red Japan Room two seated female figures writing and in conversation. This was perhaps supposed to underline both the creative origins of these specific interiors and the association of Chinoiserie interiors

with female tastes. None of the oriental interiors at Frogmore survive, but Roberts notes that some of these lacquer panels were probably transferred to the Princess Elizabeth's married home, Schloss Homburg in Hessen, Germany, where fragments survive in the 'English wing' of the palace.[29]

It is obvious that the Chinoiserie designs of the Japan Rooms at Frogmore House were closer in style to her mother's japanned Breakfast Room at Buckingham House than the Royal Pavilion interiors. The early Chinoiserie interiors by John Crace (from c. 1802, with input from his young son Frederick) for the Royal Pavilion avoided excessive japanned wall panelling and instead introduced a lighter note with pale blue wall paint or wallpaper contrasting with a darker shade of blue and two other two primary colours, red and yellow. In the wake of John Crace's death in 1811 Frederick Crace introduced large-scale wall decorations for Nash's new Music Room at the Royal Pavilion (from 1817), which appear to pick up on the lacquer panelling at Frogmore House and earlier Chinoiserie interiors at Buckingham House. The large red canvas paintings, which decorate almost the entire wall space, combine Chinese topographical and figurative motifs from William Alexander's illustrations of his Chinese travels, *The Costume of China* (1805)[30], with a paint effect of lacquered surfaces.

Carlton House

Carlton House became George IV's London residence in 1783, when he was twenty-one. Until then he had spent most of his time at Kew, Buckingham House, or Windsor Castle. Alterations under the direction of architect Henry Holland (1745–1806) began immediately after Carlton House was officially given to George IV. It was, in many ways, an architectural playground for the young prince, where he experimented with interior design schemes, some of which articulated ideas later explored further in the Royal Pavilion. Architects and designers first employed at Carlton House were later called to Brighton, including Holland and John Crace, transferring certain design ideas and styles to George IV's new seaside residence. In some cases, even pieces of furniture and decorative objects were moved from Carlton House to the Royal Pavilion. Crucially, the building featured the first Chinoiserieinteriors commissioned by George IV. These were researched in great detail by Geoffrey De Bellaigue[31], who also curated an exhibition about the decorations of Carlton House in 1991.[32]

In *Royal Residences* Pyne criticises the lack of unity of the architectural design of Carlton House, which perhaps reflects the experimental character and eclectic taste of George IV in

general: 'The general effect of the exterior of Carlton-House, combined with the Ionic screen, as viewed from the Pall Mall, although imposing in appearance, does not possess sufficient unity of character to satisfy the eye of taste'.[33] A Chinese Drawing Room at Carlton House, designed by Holland in c. 1789 and furnished in a French neo-classical style by Dominique Daguerre, is, regrettably, not described in Pyne's *Royal Residences*, possibly because by the time Pyne wrote the books these interiors had been superseded by other schemes, but two important engravings of it are included in Thomas Sheraton's *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing-Book*[34] from 1793. Sheraton mostly describes the furniture (as can be expected), such as a pier table 'richly ornamented in gold' and with a marble top, various panels painted 'in the style of the Chinese', without specific references to colour, but notes that 'the upholstery work is very richly executed in figured satin, with extremely rich borders, all worked out to suit the style of the room'.[35] It is not known when exactly the interior of this room was changed, or indeed where exactly it was located, but it is likely that some of its design elements were re-used in a later, smaller, Chinoiserie room, also absent in Pyne. The colour scheme of a later room, dating from 1805 to 1807, is described in a bill book as predominantly black and carmine, with pagodas painted on a carmine ground on the walls, while the doors were ornamented with figures in gold on a black ground. The ceiling had a ground colour of lilac and green, featuring stars and signs of the Chinese Zodiac, with a large painted dragon in the centre. At ground level the ceiling decorations were reflected in a lilac ground bamboo trellis pattern.[36] While the neo-classical Chinoiserie style of Holland and Daguerre's earlier Chinese Room seems stylistically far removed from the Chinoiserie schemes of the Royal Pavilion, the later Chinese Room displayed some elements that were later found in the Royal Pavilion, notably the combination of carmine ground embellished with gold (Music Room and Red Drawing Room), central dragon ornaments on ceilings, and the rather unusual use of lilac in the bamboo trellis pattern, which can be found at skirting to dado level in the Music Room.

Pyne does describe another room with Chinoiserie elements at Carlton House, the Rose-Satin Drawing Room: 'Situated in the south front of Carlton-House, this elegant room forming the bow which marks the centre of the building. Its embellishments are partly composed of furniture in the Chinese style, although its architecture and other decorations are generally in correspondence with the rest of the apartments.'[37] In this interior, created before 1818, Chinoiserie consists merely of additional ornaments: a chimney piece, clocks, mandarin figures and fretwork furniture, all set against an essentially classical interior of a rose-coloured satin as ground colour. It is interesting, though, that the colours of a pair of *pietradura* tables flanking the chimneypiece are described as 'proper', a term also frequently used by the Craces in the *Crace Ledger*[38] for work carried out at the Royal Pavilion:

> The ceiling is lightly ornamented in stucco-work, partially gilt [...]. The walls are covered with rose-coloured satin damask, with gold mouldings; the upper part being enriched by festoons of the same beautiful materials [...]. The chimney-piece is in the Chinese style, and executed in rosaantiqua marble and or-molu, supporting a magnificent looking-glass of British manufacture; the hangings, too, and other furniture are nearly all of English fabric. On the mantel-piece are a clock and braces for lights, in the Chinese character of design, and small china paterae borne upon metal tripods. On each side of the room are rosaantiqua tables, supported by Chinese frame-work, ornaments and mandarin figures, beneath which are recumbent Chinese figures of larger dimensions. Upon the tables are vases and other ornaments of beautiful china; and on each side of the fireplace are cabinets curiously embossed with lapis lazuli, agate, and other valuable stone, in imitation of baskets of fruit, flowers, &c. in their proper colours.[39]

At least three of the Mandarin figures from Carlton House were later transferred to the Royal Pavilion[40], as was the pier table from the earlier Chinese Drawing Room, and placed in the Long Gallery. It is possible that the rose-satin background from Carlton House was one of the inspirations for the pink Chinoiserie wallpaper design in the Royal Pavilion's Long Gallery.

It is clear that Carlton House represents in many respects a predecessor of the colour and design schemes of the Royal Pavilion, and is described by De Bellaigue as 'a testing ground for the Prince of Wales's essays in Chinoiserie, which found their fullest expression in Brighton Pavilion'.[41]

George IV's involvement in design decisions

Despite the now considerable amount of literature on George IV as collector and patron of the arts, the details of how he communicated with the architects, designers and artists he commissioned remain obscure and must be obtained predominantly from the artwork and their development themselves, circumstantial evidence and very limited archival material. The editor of George IV's letters, A. Aspinall, explains in one of his editions that, of the main

body of papers relating to George IV, many letters were examined after George IV's death by one of his executors, the Duke of Wellington, who selected and destroyed much of his private correspondence, including correspondence with his first, illegal, wife Maria Fitzherbert, 1833.[42] The surprising lack of letters discussing matters of personal taste in art, new design ideas or passions for a particular style or colour might well be explained by the destruction of more personal letters. The number of surviving letters to and from artists, architects and designers is frustratingly small, with documentation mostly limited to account books, expense ledgers and inscriptions on design drawings. Morley suggests that protocol forbade direct exchange with artists and designers, or that communication via letter was not necessary.[43]The lack of substantial written evidence notwithstanding, E. Maurice Bloch, Keeper of Prints and Drawings at the Cooper Union Museum, New York, who studied the design drawings for the Royal Pavilion in great detail, is of the opinion that the 'active and personal interest of the Prince Regent in his marine residence overshadowed and influenced every detail of the work created there' and suggests that 'in Frederick Crace and Robert Jones, and their assistants, he found as well a freedom entirely in accord with his own [...]'[44]. He continues to paint a picture of George IV as the mastermind of the opulent project that was the creation of the Royal Pavilion, '[...] a kind of Royal impresario about to embark on operatic production, the staging envisioned over a long period, every detail planned in his fertile mind with relation to the final effect.'[45]

Indeed, the *Crace Ledger* includes many references to the presence of George IV during the installation of ornaments, the hanging of wallpaper and changes to certain designs, supporting Morley's suggestion that discussion of design issues was not considered appropriate for written communication and demanded site visits. A closer look at these site visits paints a vivid picture of George IV's direct involvement in the design process and his remarkably close observation of the changes being made to the Royal Pavilion. An early entry in the *Crace Ledger*from the 1802 reveals that George IV was overseeing the hanging of some Chinese export wallpaper and other work. Frederick Crace charged for 3 ¾ days 'attending the Prince in hanging the paper in sundry rooms, attending fixing up and cutting out the Birds, &c on the paper in Saloon'[46]. A particularly detailed entry in the *Crace Ledger* records the regular attendance of George IV between July 1815 and March 1816, marking the beginning of the major interior and exterior transformation of the Royal Pavilion under John Nash(1752 –1835).[47]

George IV also attended the hanging of the precious Chinese export wallpaper (referred to as 'India Paper' and arranged for installation in August 1815) around the same time: 'Mr Crace and his men attending His Royal Highness in arranging the hanging of the India Paper and birds in Saloon, Prince Regent's Bedroom and other rooms.' [48] A similar entry is found in 1818, which also alludes to George IV making drawings of his design ideas and patterns:

> Attending at Brighton by His Royal Highness's command from the 23rd December to the 28th in making designs for the finishing of the ornamental painting of the Music Room.
> To Artist's time assisting in making drawings and patterns.
> Carriage, Lodging, &c
> Preparing designs for His Royal Highness in London and also some large patterns on linen by his desire for the finishing of the Music Room.
> Paid Artist's time and materials &c assisting for the above.
> Attending His Royal Highness at Brighton in making drawings and putting in patterns on the wall of the Music Room as intended to be finished.[49]

A note by J.G. Crace in a sketchbook by Frederick Crace[50] further illustrates how George IV would have perused, discussed and chosen ornaments and colour schemes for the Royal Pavilion. J.G. Crace records on the flyleaf: 'Scraps from Chinese ornaments drawn by Frederick Crace. This book was often looked on by George IV'.[51]

An entry from 1819/20 in the *Crace Ledger* reveals how particular George IV was about details of the design scheme, especially concerning colour. Here he changes his mind about the particular colour of imitation ribbons (from blue to lilac) in the Music Room:

> Preparing and painting in imitation of bamboo the receded ceiling at each end of the room and ornamenting the same with blue ribbons and highly varnished.
> Repainting the ribbons Lilac instead of blue, by order of His Majesty[52]

In another incident, the Craces charged £49 for removing some 'gold speckling' on several doors because George IV had not approved of the decoration. The same entry also records the preparation of design drawings for the inspection of George IV:

> Preparing and fixing up various patterns for the approbation of His Majesty, Artist's and men's time and material.

...

Preparing and gilding in Green Gold the stiles of 7 pair of folding doors and linings, redone in consequence of the Gold speckling not being approved of.[53]

Entries like these prompted Morley to suggest that George IV was 'always in direct intercourse, on more than equal terms, with his architects and decorators – constantly at their elbows; designing; making technical suggestions; ordering, and no doubt cajoling with his well-known 'condescension'; often rejecting, as is seen over and over again in frequent changes of mind and changes of scheme.'[54]

A couple of rough sketches of Royal Pavilion designs created by George IV himself survive. Morley believed that George IV's interest in fashion and masquerade costumes might have been precursors to a preference for complementary colour schemes, referring to a sketch in his own hand of a Hussar's uniform.[55] Jane Roberts, too, attests to the practical design interests of George IV, and his focus on fashion and interior design:

> The few drawings that survive from the Prince of Wales's hand are, perhaps characteristically, sketches of designs for furniture, a fountain, and for the decoration of the panels of the New Music Room at Brighton Pavilion in 1818 (1962 7 14 34). His interest in design and his own clothes manifested itself in his earliest drawings, in 1780 for a tripod or therme made up for him by a cabinet maker, and the present elaborate Hussar's uniform with a jewelled sword and flowered blue sash which he evidently intended to wear to a masquerade celebrating his twenty-first birthday.[56]

The few remaining designs, so Morley concludes, 'have a nervous, broken line that never assumes any fluency of expression ... a near ideal situation for patronage, given such lofty station, abilities and access to money and credit'.[57]

Finally, George IV's close supervision of any aspect of building work and design projects is also reported in the context of the production of John Nash's *The Royal Pavilion at Brighton* from 1826[58], a visual record of his Oriental Palace in Brighton, in the form of watercolours by Augustus Charles Pugin(1762 - 1832), which were later published as hand-coloured aquatints in an elaborate folio edition. Benjamin Ferrey, chronicler and biographer of father and son Pugin, records that George IV revised the proof impressions of the engraved plates for the book personally.[59] According to Ferrey, Pugin was also once surprised by the King while making the sketches for the work in the Royal Pavilion, clearly intent on inspecting the progress the artist was making:

> He was engaged in one of the galleries of the Pavilion colouring a view. Deeply intent upon his drawing, he did not observe that someone had entered the apartment, but on looking round, to his surprise, saw the King, who was then advancing to the spot where he was sitting. Pugin had scarcely time to rise when the King, passing by him and not perceiving a stool on which a colour-box was placed, accidentally overthrew it. The King stooped, and instantly picking up the box, gave it to Pugin with an expression of apology. [60]

Having considered the surviving examples of correspondence, records and other material concerning George IV's involvement in design decisions, I have no doubt that he was interested in every detail of the Royal Pavilion's interior design. He probably provided his designers with ideas, rough sketches and instructions, and regularly inspected and supervised the installation and execution of design schemes on site. What is less clear is how architects, interior designers and suppliers of wallpaper, furniture and other design elements communicated and worked together.

The Crace firm

The Craces were a family of artists and designers who worked as gilders and interior decorators for five consecutive generations, from c. 1750 until 1899, when John DibleeCrace (1838- 1919) closed the firm. The firm had been set up in 1768 by Edward Crace (1725 - 1799). Royal patronage was secured early on and Edward Crace was appointed Curator of the Royal Pictures in the mid-1770s. His son John (1754 - 1819) joined the family firm in 1780 and was, with his son Frederick (1779 - 1859) frequently employed by leading British architects, including Henry Holland at Carlton House and the Chinese Dairy at Woburn Abbey, John Soane at his house in Lincoln's Inn Fieldsand Pitzhanger Manor, Ealing, and eventually John Nash. John and Frederick Crace were the principal designers of the Chinoiserie interiors implemented in the Royal Pavilion interiors from c. 1801, with John having been the driving creative force in this first Chinoiserie phase. In the period during and immediately after John Nash's oriental transformation and extension of Holland's Neo-classical Pavilion (from 1815 onwards), Frederick Crace took the artistic lead and was responsible for the large project of the new Music Room, the Long Gallery

and the redecoration of many other areas of the building. John Crace died in 1819, so it can be presumed that the majority of the work at the Royal Pavilion after 1815 was carried out by Frederick Crace.

The work of the Craces is well-recorded, with hundreds of design drawings, letters, sketchbooks and other documents surviving in various collections and libraries. The Craces have been the subject of Dr Megan Aldrich's comprehensive research over many years, leading to the retrospective exhibition *The Craces: Royal Decorators 1768 – 1899* at Brighton Museum and Art Gallery in 1990. I will, therefore, not go into great detail about the specifics of the history of the Crace firm. Instead I will highlight a number of stylistic characteristics in their Royal Pavilion work.

Sources of inspiration

The large numbers of design drawings by the Craces relating to the Royal Pavilion interiors and the good documentation of their professional and private occupation provide ample information about their tastes and working methods and the inspiration for their choice of colour schemes. The Craces' interests and artistic range were wide, and they appear to have been studious and well-informed. As Aldrich states in her doctoral thesis, 'a history of the Crace firm entails the study of coach painting, restoration and curatorial work, house decoration, the decorating of public buildings, furniture making, textile and wallpaper production, upholstery and drapery [...]'[61] John and Frederick appear not to have travelled to the Far East, but they were familiar with the early Chinoiserie interiors at Carlton House and the collections of export ware owned by Queen Charlotte. John Crace himself owned a large collection of oriental artefacts and the firm supplied clients with Chinese export ware. This allowed the Craces to study the design, ornamentation and colouring of Chinese art from the actual objects. Both Morley and Aldrich point out that George IV and the Craces shared a passion for Chinese objects and refer to a painting by Dighton of Frederick Crace presenting a piece of oriental china to George IV.[62]

Other obvious sources of inspiration for the Craces were illustrated travel books. The Sotheby sales catalogue from July 7, 1819 of John Crace's library lists fourteen books on China alone[63], including William Alexander's *Costume of China*, which greatly informed the Music Room and other decorations in the Royal Pavilion. The Crace's design drawings reveal what Gordon Lang calls 'a very close, almost slavish adherence to original Chinese sources'[64]. The figurative hand-coloured engravings from *Costume of China* found their way on to the central chandelier in the Music Room and also inspired the glass panels on the landings of the North and South Staircase. Here, the colours chosen by the Craces, bright and mostly primary or secondary tints, copy the colour schemes of the engravings.

The Crace design drawings for the Royal Pavilion interiors

Bloch assigns to both Frederick and John Crace (in his studies identified as Anonymous Designer I and Anonymous Designer II respectively, since few of the drawings are signed or dated) a good understanding of colour: '[Designer I's] use of colour is rich and brilliant, frequently exotic, but always harmonious [...] Designer II is less interested in precise draughtsmanship and fine details, but somewhat more concerned with the achievement of texture and colour, generally using marbleized surfaces and trellis work pattern in gay abandon.'[65] Apart from a large number of trellis work designs there is also at least one detailed pencil drawing of a design for a lantern, which includes a number system that records the colours as found on the original piece of export ware the drawing is based on. Another ink and pencil drawing of a specific design for the South Galleries on the upper floor of the Royal Pavilion has clear colour instructions added to the design drawing.

However, most Crace designs are marked by a two-dimensional quality, with colour schemes that seldom use blended tints, gradation, subtle shading or tertiary colours. This is particularly obvious when comparing lacquer work produced by Frederick Crace and Robert Jones. Crace designs often remain literally two-dimensional, despite attempts at shading. Movement and depth is created mainly by the reflective quality of the yellow and gold paint and colour contrast. This is described in the *Crace Ledger* as 'Preparing and painting in crimson 14 large pannels to Doors, richly ornamented with Chinese Devices in yellow, heightened in gold varnished and polished'[66]. By comparison, the detail of a Saloon door by Jones shows thickly applied paint and raised surfaces, which give the impression of a carved relief.

While this could be explained by the Craces' style of 'slavish' copying of original sources, it might also express an understanding of the colour wheel. A reduced number of colours in any design scheme, picked from the artist's range of primary and secondary colours, ensures brilliant and intensive effects, especially when complementary colours are combined. It is highly likely that the Craces not only understood the colouring style of Chinese artefacts but were also familiar with contemporary literature about colour and may thus have applied complementary colours in pure tints in order to achieve a particularly vibrant effect. In the Royal Pavilion interiors this is

distinctly expressed in the overall colour scheme of the Music Room, where the three dominant tints are the highly saturated primaries red, blue and yellow/gold.The Crace Saloon scheme from c.1815, too, illustrates the penchant for tri-chromacy in the Craces' work. Two sketches of a fantastic bird by Frederick Crace illustrate his attention to figurative detail and outline and may constitute further prove that he tended to draw outlines first, before colouring in the spaces. The coloured-in version of the bird design not only resembles bright colour schemes on decorated Chinese porcelain, but shows a palette reduced to five clear tints from a painter's basic colour wheel: blue, red, yellow, green and lilac (pale purple).

The language used by the Craces in their accounts to describe the colours and finishes applied in the Royal Pavilion between 1802 and 1823 has been partly investigated by Brough in 'The Significance of Sheen: Surface Finish as an Important Aspect of Early Nineteenth Century Interiors'[67]. Brough notes that frequent references to the application of multiple layers of varnish or paint, enriching, heightening, and 'high polishing'[68] suggest 'a preoccupation with variety and with surface effect: there are many references to different treatments over one area'[69], for example 'richly polished' elements adjacent to 'flatted' areas. Such variations in surface finish in close proximity, Brough argues, 'would reflect the light in different ways, and the decorator [Crace] appears to take for granted that the choice of language is understood and the resulting effect the one desired'[70].

The frequency of colour names listed in the *Crace Ledger* shows an even distribution of the primaries yellow (127), blue (154) and red (159). Green is mentioned sixty-eight times and pink sixty-six times, while purple, lilac and scarlet feature sixteen, sixteen and fifteen times respectively, with other colour names used in significantly fewer instances. Of the 'common colours' it is notable that while white is mentioned 111 times, other a-chromatic colours feature significantly less: black thirty-nine times, grey thirty-seven times and brown eleven times. Pigments are rarely specified, but there are a total of seven references to Chinese red and Chinese vermilion, five mentions of verdegrease/verdigrease, two of chrome/crome yellow, one of patent yellow and four of carmine, and nine of flake white.

Robert Jones

From at least 1815 the designer and artist Robert Jones became one of the most important creative forces in the final decorative scheme of the Royal Pavilion during and after Nash's transformation. He was responsible for the design of the Red Drawing Room, the Banqueting Room, the Saloon scheme of 1823, elements of the Music and various other parts of the Royal Pavilion.

Jones's use of colour and choice of motifs is distinctive, bold and imaginative. The lack of information and hard data about Jones means that in literature he is rarely considered separately from the Craces. Even in Morley's substantial work *The Making of the Royal Pavilion,* Jones is incorporated in the chapter about the Crace firm, although Morley presents him as a rival to the 'great ability and virtuosity' of the Craces, attributing a 'spontaneity and fire' to his designs.[71]

Very little is known about this important figure. This section will first gather any information about the artist that can be extracted from the few surviving sources documenting his life and work. It will also discuss a number of artists of the same name who might be the Jones in question. It will then consider various sources of inspiration for Jones's decorative schemes at the Royal Pavilion. Finally, relevant account and inventory entries, surviving design drawings, interiors and objects will be analysed, in order to establish Jones's style, techniques and design choices with regard to colour.

There is no confirmed date of birth or death for the Robert Jones who worked at the Royal Pavilion and his identity cannot be attributed with certainty to any of the artists of that name working in Britain between 1790 and 1850. Jones is first mentioned in the *Crace Ledger* in the period covering October to Christmas 1815, where Crace lists charges for 'Ornamental painting &c' in the Entrance Hall. The exact entry reads 'Painting and coloring 19 pannels white for Mr Jones and afterwards repairing and coloring Do in consequence of Mr Jone's [sic] paintings being removed'[72], at the cost of £11.12s. This is part of other decoration work in this room, including the painting of the walls, cornices and ceiling, and the painting, silvering and varnishing ornaments: 'Preparing and coloring the ceiling sky color and clouding Do; Ornamenting a scollop ornament veined pink and high varnished; Preparing the cornice and painting it in imitation of pink Chinese marble; 40 bells, balls, and chains painted yellow and afterwards silvered and varnished green; Preparing and coloring walls green'[73]. It is not quite clear what these paintings were that had been removed, but the entry suggests that they were installed some time before this date. This places Jones in the building considerably before October 1815, the date conventionally assigned to his work in the Royal Pavilion. Moreover, the fact that here work is done *for* Jones and in preparation for his work places him in a position of relative authority, which reflects his expertise and craftsmanship. Significantly, in this last quarter of 1815, re-decorations and repair

works on a large scale were carried out, marking the beginning of the complete transformation under Nash, which would take place over the next eight years.

Jones is mentioned again in the same quarter in relation to a visit from George IV, during which he supervises the hanging of various paintings and patterns, including Jones's: 'Attending His Royal Highness with 9 assistants putting in patterns to Small Drawing Room, arranging the pictures, India paper &c in Yellow Drawing Room; putting in patterns to Entrance Hall and Gallery and arranging Mr Jone's [sic] pictures'.[74] Jones is not mentioned again in the *Crace Ledger*, despite the large projects carried out in the Royal Pavilion over the next eight years, often requiring close collaboration of the Craces, Jones and Nash. This suggests that Jones worked as an independent artist and was no longer employed by the Craces from at least 1816 onwards.

In the *Royal Pavilion Abstract of Accounts*[75], Jones is described as 'Robert Jones, Artist' throughout. He refers to himself in the same way in the *Robert Jones Accounts*. He is first mentioned in the former in relation to the furniture makers Mssrs. Bailey & Saunders in 1817, who made six 'Pedestals for the Orlean Vases made to Mr. Jones design'[76] for the Music Room. The same entry also explains that Jones oversees the making of objects designed by him: 'To mak'g a Model of do for Mr. Vulliamy with very rich carved Ornam'ts under Mr. Jones superintendence'[77], once again highlighting his superior role within the team of interior designers. In the same year Bailey & Saunders carve, prepare, silver, and eventually install the large central dragon in the Banqueting Room, as well as making a large sideboard, both designed by Jones. Jones again supervises some of the work, including making two additional models of the dragon, the whereabouts of which are unknown:

> To a very large Dragon for the Centre of the Room richly carved with extend'd Wings to suspend Chandeliers &prepar'g it for silvering.
> To silvering it at Brighton.
> To mak'g&alt'g at sundry times 2 Models of the Dragon originally designed by Mr. Jones and under his superintendence.
> To a very large & superbly decorated Sideboard made of very fine Rosewood Snakewood and Satin Wood with 12 large Dragons &Ornam'ts richly carved and double Gilt in the very best manner to Mr. Jones's design.[78]

Further similar references are found in 1822 and 1823 concerning much of the furniture, ornaments and fittings in the Saloon and many mirrors ('glasses') designed for various parts of the building, including the 'New North Building'. All these entries combined are evidence for Robert Jones' skills, versatility and status as both painter/decorator and designer, and suggest that by 1822 Jones was highly experienced and perhaps at the height of his career.

An 'R. Jones' is mentioned in 1826 in Smith's *The Cabinet-maker and Upholsterer's Guide*[79]. In a chapter entitled 'Interior decoration', which, incidentally, follows on from a chapter on 'Colouring', Smith notes that there is great talent among British interior designers, and singles out Jones as the leading professional in this category:

> We have however in the present day many decorative artists (natives of our own soil) of great merit, some of whom possess uncommon versatility of talent; performing equally well both in oil and distemper colour, the three branches of decorative art; viz. figure, landscape, and ornamental painting in all its variety; as the numerous works of Mr. R. Jones (who stands at the head of his profession) sufficiently testify.[80]

Circumstantial evidence, such as royal patronage enjoyed by both Smith and Jones, and the publication of this book just three years after the completion of the Royal Pavilion interiors, strongly suggests that this is indeed the highly respected Robert Jones from the Royal Pavilion.

Of similar circumstantial weight is the mention of a Jones as one of a number of artists, of 'high talent', by John Gregory Crace in the first of 'Two Lectures on the History of Paperhangings', delivered to the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1839.[81]Crace singles out Mssr George and Frederick Eckhardt, who established their business in Chelsea, London, in 1786, as paperhangers of 'considerable taste and spirit', who produced papers 'of such elegance and beauty, as far surpassed those of all other countries'[82]. He praises the variety of manufacturing methods and the high quality printing and goes on to explain that the print designs were 'finished by Artists constantly retained by the Manufacturers, men of considerable talent, among whom were MM. Boileau, Feuglet, Joinot and Jones; and these again were assisted in the inferior parts of the Painting by young girls, of whom more than 50 were employed.'[83] It is noticeable that Jones is the only British name among what appears to be a group of artists of French background. Morley acknowledges that this evidence is slight, but he argues that Jones's 'individual style and the occupation of Robert Jones himself, is perfectly consistent with such previous work, and

makes the identification possible.'[84] Morley further suggests that if this were indeed the Royal Pavilion Jones, he might have developed his particular 'verve and dash' during his time as the only British among foreign artists.[85]

One specific technique employed at George and Frederick Eckhardt might be further support for this theory: J.G. Crace explains that the Eckhardt papers were 'not only printed on Paper, but also on Silk, Satin and Linen – by printing too an underground of silver or gold, they obtained very beautiful effects of colour.'[86] In *The History of Wallpaper, 1509-1914* Sugden and Edmondson record that the Eckhardts were granted various patents for production methods resulting in rich decorative designs, such as one 'for a method of printing designs in imitation of needle-work, for printing from engraved plates filled in with colour and rubbed off like ordinary copper-plate printing, for printing in oil colours, and for preparing and printing in silver leaf to resemble silk and lace stuffs for use as hangings for rooms.'[87] In Jones's later work in the Royal Pavilion (1817-1823) it is clear that he was experimenting on a large scale with silver undergrounds in the form of carved and silvered objects and fittings, often overlaid with transparent glazes. Silver and gold leaf formed the background for the figurative Chinoiserie paintings on the four walls of the Banqueting Room. Jones also used silver leaf as an integral part in the printed and stencilled wallpaper designs for the Banqueting Room and Saloon, on Prussian blue and white ground respectively. It may be that the techniques patented byGeorge and Eckhardt were partly developed by Jones. Although there is evidence for earlier uses of silvering in the Royal Pavilion on export wallpaper and to designs by the Craces, Jones's use of silver is hugely imaginative and more varied than that of the Craces.

The Royal Pavilion interiors make it more than likely that Jones learned about the use and decorative effect of silver and gold and was inspired to experiment with silver in combination with overlaid colour while working for the Eckhardts early in his career. As Sugden and Edmondson pointed out, the Eckhardts were also known for their high quality imitation of Chinese export wallpaper, so it is possible that this is where Jones had an early professional exposure to Chinoiserie designs and motifs, such as fantastical birds: 'An extremely interesting feature of this reproduction [of Chinese wallpaper] is that a fine engraved plate has been used, to emphasise in black the outline and finer features of the stork panel, the feathers of the birds being reproduced in most effective fashion. The process is known to have been used by the Eckhardts, of Chelsea, who flourished at the end of the 18th century.'[88] The Eckhardts went bankrupt in or around 1792[89] and the last confirmed work by Robert Jones dates from the early 1830s, so even a cautious estimate of Robert Jones working at the Royal Pavilion in his early forties to mid- fifties would place him at the Eckhardts as a very young man, perhaps first in the role of apprentice or trainee.

Apart from his large-scale involvement in the Royal Pavilion from at least 1815 to 1923, little is known about Jones's other work and so far he cannot be associated with any other major building or decorating project, although a few smaller projects are recorded. A 'Jones' painted three octagonal ceiling paintings and four overdoor paintings in neo-classical style for the State Dining Room (the State Gallery until 1817) and a number of paintings for the staircase area at Stowe House in Buckinghamshire, either when the owner was the Marquess of Buckingham (1778 to 1813) or the first Duke of Buckingham and Chandos (1813 to 1839). This work cannot be dated accurately, but is first mentioned in 1817 in a contemporary guidebook that went into many editions between 1744 and 1827, published by Benton Seely[90]: 'The Grand Stair-Case, adorned with paintings by Jones – leads to the Bed Rooms in the upper storey'[91] and in the State Dining Room 'The cieling [sic] ornamented with gilding, by Sclater, and paintings by Jones. [...] Four paintings in ChiaroScuro, copied by Jones from subjects found in Herculeneum, are over the doors.'[92]. The last Seeley edition from 1827 confirms that the dining room paintings were still in place in 1827, but no mention is made of the staircase paintings.

In 1990, the author of a new guidebook of Stowe, Michael Bevington, recorded that the ceiling probably deteriorated badly and that parts of it had been replaced, including the paintings by Jones (now referred to as grisailles). Bevington also attests that they are 'probably by Robert Jones, the chief assistant to Frederick Crace at the Brighton Pavilion', although no documentary evidence is given.The paintings are all neo-classical in subject matter and style:'They are Venus disarming Cupid (east end), Venus on her Chariot, crowned by Cupid and attended by the Three Graces (centre) and Venus at her Toilet, attended by the Graces (west end). [...] There are eight smaller ones set into the ceiling depicting two pairs of vases and two of classical reliefs.'[93]Bevington makes a further possible attribution to Jones of a large central painting entitled *Venus Blindfolding Cupid* in the Chandos Houseroom, the northern half of which had, in the mid-eighteenth century, been decorated in a Japanese style, with the southern half forming a so-called Chinese Closet.[94] It is cautiously suggested that Robert Adam carried out the enlargement and re-decoration of the room in the early 1770s, which suggests that the Jones painting must have been a later addition.

A likely identification is that of an 'R Jones' who engraved several drawings by

OctavienDalvimart for a publication entitled *The Costume of Turkey*[95]. The book was published by William Miller in 1802 and again in 1804. The text of *Costume of Turkey* was almost certainly compiled by William Alexander, who wrote and illustrated *The Costume of China*for the same series. The preface of *Costume of Turkey* stresses the appeal and importance of the accurate depiction of the colours: 'the merits of this work depend upon the accuracy and beauty of the drawings and truth of the colouring'. The volumes are lavishly illustrated with hand-coloured engraved plates and R Jones is one of the engravers in the Turkey volume, alongside John Dadley (1767–after 1807) and William Poole (active 1803–1807). Alexander's *China* volume has a subscribers' list that is led by King George III ('His Majesty's Libraries, London and Kew'), the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Clarence and Princess Elizabeth[96], meaning that at least four, if not five, copies were in the royal libraries, and it is confirmed that the Craces used Alexander's illustrations as templates for many of the Chinoiserie designs for the Royal Pavilion. The circumstantial links between Robert Jones and this engraver are therefore strong, and could be further supported by the fact that, if he had been at Eckhardts Paperhangers in the 1780s and early 1790s, he would have acquired considerable engraving skills there. These skills he may then have applied in this publishing project. John Dinkel linked the Royal Pavilion Jones to the engraver of the Turkish costume volume in his guidebook from 1983[97]. He wrongly referred to Jones as the illustrator, but did note the similarity in style to the figurative wall panels in the Banqueting Room.[98] If the engraver was indeed the same person as the Royal Pavilion artist, this publication might account for his being noticed by the Craces or George IV for the Royal Pavilion project.

However, with regard to the colouring style of Jones's Chinoiserie panels in the Banqueting Room of the Royal Pavilion, it is important to note that they differ significantly from Alexander's figurative illustrations and indeed the way these were copied for use in the Royal Pavilion by the Craces. While Alexander's mostly depict single figures that show as much detail of the costume and accessoriesas possible, Jones's Chinoiserie scenes are carefully composed groups of figures in a fictional narrative context. The colouring, though vibrant, is much more graded and of subtle tonality than the rather two-dimensional designs in primary and secondary colours by Alexander and their almost identical copies by the Craces. In general, Jones's Banqueting Room panels are more reminiscent of French Rococo Chinoiseries in the manner of François Boucher. It is highly likely that Jones drew inspiration from French art and was aware of Boucher's work through exposure to French artists and decorators earlier in his career. This would explain his preference for subtler colouring and gradation, compared to the bolder and more linear Alexander images. It is also likely that Jones at some point had travelled to the continent and seen examples of French or German Rococo Chinoiserie interiors.

Considerable unpublished research was carried out by Royal Pavilion conservator Gordon Grant into Jones possibly having worked at Northumberland House, London, for the Third Duke of Northumberland in the 1820s, and a young Robert Jones who was sent to the Royal Academy by the Stowe family and who may have taught drawing to a young George Gilbert Scott in the 1810s. The Northumberland connection has the strongest documentary evidence: Two bills from Robert Jones, copied from a bill book for works carried out in three rooms at Northumberland House (the Glass Drawing Room[99], the Tapestry Room and the upper part of the Grand Staircase), record 'Ornamental embellishments and Decoration Painting Done for His Grace The Duke of Northumberland at Northumberland House under the direction of Mr Parsons' in 1822.[100] The detailed description of the work includes 'Painting and exact restoration of the Whole of the enriched ceiling of the Glass Drawing Room, prepared from the plaster, and finished in all its Ornamental detail in Gold and Silver [...] relieved with a variety of tints' and 'Groupes of Figures in colors forming Pictures, illustrative of different Subjects from the Heathen Mythology [...]'[101]. Jones charged the considerable sums of £1,532 and £393 for the work carried out at Northumberland House.

The recurring references to his painting methods and working with silver on or in combination with coloured grounds are reminiscent of much of his later work in the Royal Pavilion, which is carried out around the same time as the Northumberland House decorations. The description of the figurative paintings reminds one of both the work identified at Stowe and the figurative Chinoiserie panels in the Royal Pavilion Banqueting Room, leaving little doubt that this is indeed the Robert Jones from the Royal Pavilion. This also suggests that Jones was extremely busy in the year 1822, commuting between two high-profile but geographically distant commissions. The notion of a solitary artist might therefore have to be revised. It is likely that Jones had numerous assistants and was delegating and overseeing large projects, rather than carrying them out on his own.

There is evidence of Robert Jones continuing to enjoy royal patronage after George IV's death in 1830. In 2007 Hugh Roberts published an article based on newly discovered archival material in which he discusses a substantial commission for new furniture designs for the principal apartments at Windsor Castle to Robert Jones in 1833.[102]Among the designs Jones submitted were four for canopied thrones for William IV and Queen Adelaide. The drawings for

these thrones survive in the Royal Library.[103] The designs are in classical and gothic style, with blue and crimson or crimson and pink hangings characteristic of a generic regal colour scheme. While this commission does not add much valuable information about Jones's use of colour, it does gives a rare insight into Jones's research methods, with the artist claiming in his bill that part of the expenditure was incurred by researching illuminated manuscripts and other documents in the King's Library at the British Museum and the Earl Marshal's and the Lord Chamberlain's Offices, in order to represent any ornament relating to the Order of the Garter correctly on the throne designs.[104]

A last likely reference to Jones working for the Royal Family is found in *The British Imperial Calendar* for 1838, where an entry, under 'Trades People to Queen Adelaide' lists a 'Painter, Robert Jones'.[105] After this date there are no further references to Jones working on any commissions. The Royal Pavilion Jones must have died some time before 1850, as he is referred to as 'the late Mr Jones' in Wilmott's*Descriptive Guide to the Palace and Gardens of the Royal Pavilion at Brighton* from 1851: 'The decorative work in this room ['The Ladies Retiring Room', i.e. the Red Drawing Room south of the Green Entrance Hall] is in exactly the same style as in the time of George IV, and was designed by the late Mr. Jones, as also the decorations of the Banqueting Room and the Saloon; [...]'.[106]

In view of the lack of literature and biographical data, Jones's few surviving design sketches and a number of Royal Pavilion -related archival records constitute the only reliable sources for understanding his style, colour choices and aesthetic ideas and inspirations. Three drawings by Jones are in the collection of the Royal Pavilion, all of them signed and dated. A few drawings in the Cooper-Hewitt collection have been cautiously attributed to Jones, but none of these are signed. Morley discussed the differences as well as similarities in the style of Frederick Crace and Jones, the difficulty of distinguishing and attributing many of the drawings and the complexity of some of the design projects in the Royal Pavilion.[107] He stated, for example, that the Music Room 'was a complicated undertaking that probably needed all available forces; one finds that in less complicated areas – for example the Red Drawing Room or the King's Apartments – one artist (in this case Jones) appears to have been employed.'[108] A collaborative and mutually inspiring working relationship between the Craces and Jones is therefore more likely than any notion of rivalry.

While Jones generally embraced highly saturated colour schemes and the use of primary and secondary colours, which was entirely in keeping with the distinctly individual Chinoiserie style of the Royal Pavilion, it is also noticeable that Jones experimented more with colour schemes and introduced a wider range of shades and surface finishes than the Craces. I have already mentioned Jones's penchant for imaginative and large scale use of silvering and the possible Rococo influence on the palette of the figurative Chinoiserie panels in the Banqueting Room. Another characteristic of Jones's work was a greater variety of shades and the inclusion of tertiary colours, in contrast to the Craces' preference for clear primary and secondary tints. Jones also frequently painted subtle gradations of colours, often on a single object or in a clearly defined paint area. While shading was applied by the Craces in their trellis work designs, where it represented actual shadows created by the trellis work as part of the trompe l'oeil effect, gradation within one colour or from one colour to another is almost exclusively found in Jones's work. A good example of this are the supporting and engaged columns in the Red Drawing Room, where a subtle change from a muted ochre colour (in imitation of bamboo) to a realistic green, representing palm tree leaves, can be observed. The relevant description of these trees has already been cited in relation to Chambers' palm tree ornaments at Kew. Morley concluded that, compared to the ability and virtuosity of Crace's work, 'Jones's designs are more *spirituelle* than Frederick Crace's; they have spontaneity and fire'[109].

Jones's use of colour can further be described and analysed by comparing his work in the Royal Pavilion with the surviving documentation relating to this work. The section on Jones in the *Royal Pavilion Abstract of Accounts*[110] and his own, slightly more detailed, account books (*Robert Jones Accounts*), both covering the period from 5 July 1821 to 10 October 1823, give an insight into his particular style and methods and will be discussed here.

Jones mentioned relatively few specific colours and even fewer pigments in his accounts. The pigments he referred to are carmine lake, chrome yellow and Chinese vermillion. While the recent introduction of chrome yellow to the range of pigments available commercially in Britain suggests that Jones was here referring to the actual pigment, it is questionable whether his Chinese vermillion was indeed sourced from China. It is possible that this was vermillion manufactured in Europe but described as Chinese in order to highlight its brilliance and quality. Likewise, a reference to Chinese imperial yellow, listed in connection with the walls of the Yellow Ante-Room to the King's Apartments, probably described a highly saturated yellow colour instead of providing concise information about the pigment used to create the colour. It is hence a colour name, evocative of yellow ground Chinese export ware or Imperial court robes. The time frame of the interiors of the Yellow Ante-Room suggests the pigment was mostly likely to have been chrome yellow.

Jones was also quite specific in his descriptions of techniques and materials, frequently mentioning the variety of colours and even shades of gold leaf used, for example in this entry relating to the Saloon: 'Preparing with Oil, Color & c. a permanent ground to receive the decoration. … Preparing from the Master for Coloring and preparing with Oil Color for the Gilding Size.'[111] The creation of the painted surfaces of the Saloon doors, which I mentioned in the previous section in relation to the Craces, is described thus:

> Preparing and making a surface for polishing and painting the Panels, Stiles, &c. with highly polished white grounds, All the panels embellished with various Designs of Chinese subjects, in raised Japan, and highly finished with Gold, prepared of different Colors &c. &c. The Whole of the Stiles, richly wrought with minute details of Chinese ornament, &c.[112]

Jones's accounts reveal his attention to decorative detail (often with the aim to appear realistic or imitate exotic materials and objects), his interest in varied surface treatments, the use of several graded colours on individual objects, and a penchant for shimmering and reflective paint effects, resulting in a distinctive and imaginative style.

Conclusion

It can be argued that the richly ornamented and multi-coloured decorative scheme of the Royal Pavilion was a highly individual and late expression of Chinoiserie and Orientalism, and as such was without direct followers. However, George IV was clearly informed and inspired by preceding oriental structures, interiors and collections of export ware, including the buildings designed by William Chambers and others for Kew Gardens, and also by his mother's interest in Chinese porcelain and other export ware. While early Chinoiserie interiors in George IV's London residence, Carlton House, were still embedded in a Neo-classical style, other Chinoiserie interiors, introduced by his mother at Buckingham House and his sisters at Frogmore, are representative of a more colourful take on Chinoiserie, with lacquer panelling and painting in imitation of lacquer, usually with one dominant colour in each room. The various Chinoiserie interiors created at the Royal Pavilion from c. 1802 onwards were yet another manifestation of this style, replacing lacquer panelled wall decoration of a dominant colour with much bolder, brighter and more complex themes, in which block-printed or hand-painted wallpaper, Chinese export paintings and an abundance of ornamental objects were key elements.

The building's interiors can also be seen in the wider context of colour literature and advances in pigment and paint production. The use and effect of colour in architecture played an increasingly significant part in literature on house-painting and the arts in general in the period discussed here, and it is likely that the designers of the Royal Pavilion, and perhaps George IV himself, consciously or sub-consciously incorporated new attitudes to colour in their designs or design ideas. This essay has discussed this through analysis of the particular styles of George IV's principal designers, Robert Jones and the Crace firm, and the language used to describe colours and techniques in their account books.

The decorative scheme and the use of colour in the Royal Pavilion are highly unusual and an expression of George IV's individual character and taste, but at the same time a reflection of the fashionable styles (such as Chinoiserie), Chinese export ware, intellectual discussion of colour, colour theory and advancements in pigment production in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

References

1. Aldrich, Megan, 'John Crace and John Soane: A Collaboration in Context', *in: Traditional Paint News* Vol. 2 No. 4, May 2009(Edinburgh: The Traditional Paint Forum, 2009), pp21-29.
2. Alexander, William,*The Costume of China: Illustrated in Forty-eight Coloured Engravings* (William Miller, London, 1805).
3. Aspinall (ed.), *The Letters of King George IV, 1812-30* (3 vols.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
4. Baker, Kenneth, *George IV, A Life in Caricature* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2005).
5. Bevington,Michael,*Stowe House* (London: Paul Holberton Publishing 2002).
6. *Bill Book for Works at Northumberland House,* The Northumberland Estates. S.Y.U.I.83.
7. Bloch, E. Maurice, 'Regency Styling, the Prince and the Decorator', in: *The Connoisseur,* June 1953, No.531, pp.129-132.
8. *The British Imperial Calendar for the Year of our Lord 1838, Being the First Year of the Reign of Her Present Majesty, Victoria the First, or, General Register of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and its Colonies* (London : Printed for A. Varnham, [1838]), [unpaginated].
9. Brough, Janet, 'The Significance of Sheen: Surface Finish as an Important Aspect of Early Nineteenth Century Interiors', *The Conservation of Decorative Arts* UKIC, 1999, pp.1-10.
10. Chambers, William,*Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Perspective Views of the Gardens and Buildings at Kew in Surr[e]y, the Seat of Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales* (London: J. Haberkorn, for the Author, 1763).
11. Conner, Patrick, *Oriental Architecture in the West* (London: Thames & Hudson,1979).
12. *Crace Ledger.* Transcript of copies of ledger entries from the books of Messrs Crace& Sons, during the time spent in the Pavilion 1802-04, 1815-1819, and 1820-23. The Royal Pavilion Archives.
13. Crace, Frederick,*A Frederick Crace Book of Designs.* A book with 68 coloured designs from Chinese ornaments drawn by Frederick Crace, 1800-1820. Brighton Museums & Art Gallery, Prints and Drawings Collection, FA103696.
14. Crace, John Gregory,*'The Crace Papers', Two Lectures on the History of Paperhangings, delivered to the Royal Institute of British Architects on 4th and 18th February, 1839* (no place, reprint 1939, with foreword and comments by A.V.Sugden and E.A. Entwistle).
15. Dalvimart, Octavien,*The Costume of Turkey, Illustrated by a Series of Engravings; with Descriptions in English and French* (London: William Miller, 1802).
16. De Bellaigue, Geoffrey, *Carlton House: The Past Glories of George IV's Palace* (London: Buckingham Palace, 1991).

17. De Bellaigue, Geoffrey, 'The Furnishings of the Chinese Drawing Room, Carlton House', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 109, No. 774 (Sep., 1967), pp. 518-528.
18. Dinkel, John,*The Royal Pavilion* (London: Scala/Philip Wilson, 1983).
19. Ferrey, Benjamin,*Recollections of A. N. WelbyPugin, and his Father, Augustus Pugin; With Notices of Their Works* (London: Edward Stanford, 1861).
20. Huish, Robert, *Memoirs of George the Fourth*.2 vols. (London: Thomas Kelly, 1831).
21. Morley, John, *The Making of the Royal Pavilion*, (London: Sotheby Publications, 1984).
22. Nash, John, *The Royal Pavilion at Brighton* (London: published by the command of & dedicated by permission to the King by John Nash, 1826).
23. Parissien, Steven, *George IV: The Grand Entertainment* (London: John Murray, 2001).
24. Pyne, William Henry,*The History of the Royal Residences of Windsor Castle, St. James Palace, Carlton House, Kensington Palace, Hampton Court, Buckingham House and Frogmore*(London: L. Harrison for A. Dry, 1819).
25. *Robert Jones Accounts 1821 - 1823*. Manuscript. The National Archives: Lord Chamberlain's Department: Bill Books, Series IV.
26. Roberts, Jane (ed.), *George III and Queen Charlotte: Patronage, Collecting and Court Taste* (London: Royal Collection Enterprises Ltd., 2001).
27. Roberts, Jane, *Royal Artists: From Mary Queen of Scots to the Present Day* (London: Grafton Books, 1987).
28. Roberts, Hugh 'Thrones Revisited', *Furniture History*, Vol. XLIII, 2007, pp. 43 – 54.
29. *Royal Pavilion Abstract of Accounts in the Lord Chamberlain's Department, c. 1826*. Presented by Mr. J. Haines, Ref. Lib: 23007 / SB9 / Ac2.Manuscript.The Royal Pavilion.
30. Sheraton, Thomas, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing-Book. In Three Parts.*[2 vols.] (London: T. Bensley, for the Author, 1793).
31. Smith, George, *The Cabinet-maker and Upholsterer's Guide: Being a Complete Drawing Book, in Which Will Be Comprised Treatises on Geometry and Perspective, as Applicable to the Above Branches of Mechanics* (London: Jones & Co, 1826).
32. Sugden,Alan Victor and J.L. Edmondson, *A History of English Wallpaper 1509-1914* (London, B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1926), p.110.
33. [Wilmott], *Descriptive Guide to the Palace and Gardens of the Royal Pavilion at Brighton. A New Edition, with Illustrations of the State Apartments* (Brighton: Charles Wilmott, 1851).
34. Wilson, Joan, 'A Phenomenon of Taste, The China Ware of Queen Mary II', in: *Apollo*, 96, 3, 116-23 (1972).

Palace of Puzzles

The Legacy of James Legge: Building Bridges between the Past and the Present

Anna Vermehren

This paper illustrates how social engagement in contemporary art can bring relevant histories to life, and how it can create a meaningful dialogical exchange between different cultures. Focusing on the example of Palace of Puzzles, a three month art project initiated by Deveron Arts and realised by the Utopia Group from China in 2009, this paper describes the impact of the international artistic intervention on the local context of Huntly, a small rural market town of 4500 inhabitants, located in the North East of Scotland. Set in the agricultural lands of Aberdeenshire, a region which has an average population density of 37 per square kilometer, Huntly has been a rural centre of power, trade and industry in the past.

Today, Huntly is home to a small but influential art organisation that has no gallery or commercial space dedicated to art; instead its mission is 'the town is the venue'. Established in 1994 Deveron Arts has commissioned some outstanding art by providing a framework for social engagement with the local community, its place and history.

While the term 'socially engaged art' is often understood as a tool for social change, Nicolas Bourriaud has coined an alternative term: 'relational art'. It refers to "an art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space" (Bourriaud 2002: 14). Contrasting a didactic top-down approach, the art that is produced here becomes a social occasion, an individual and a collective experience; people from different backgrounds and generations meet for an unusual aesthetic encounter that opens up meanings and enables dialogue (Vergunst,